Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/789,317	KUNZE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Edward M. Johnson	1793
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):		
(1) Edward M. Johnson.	(3) <u>Terri Mahan</u> .	
(2) Andrew Fortney.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 23 April 2008.		
Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☑ Personal [copy given to: 1)☑ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e No. ¹ If Yes, brief description:		
Claim(s) discussed: all pending.		
Identification of prior art discussed: Matsuki '570.		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) № N/A.		
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant asserted that while Matsuki does disclose washing an intermediate with water, washing the metal-contaminated compound with an immiscible solvent is not disclosed and would not have been obvious. Possible claim amendments were also discussed.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims		
allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)		
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.		
	Lill Mid	
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an	Examiner's signature, if requi	red